```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
               HONORABLE LARRY ALAN BURNS, JUDGE PRESIDING
 3
 4
      UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 5
                                           CASE NO. 07CR00329-LAB
                   PLAINTIFF,
                                                    07CR00330-LAB
 6
              VS.
                                           SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
 7
                                           JULY 30, 2007
      KYLE DUSTIN FOGGO, (1)
                                           2:30 P.M.
      BRENT ROGER WILKES, (2)
 8
      BRENT ROGER WILKES, (1)
 9
      JOHN THOMAS MICHAEL, (2)
10
                    DEFENDANTS.
11
                          REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
12
            07CR00329: STATUS CONFERENCE (1,2)
13
            07CR00330: STATUS CONFERENCE (1,2)
14
15
      APPEARANCES:
                                    KAREN P. HEWITT, U.S. ATTORNEY
      FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
16
                                    BY: PHILLIP L.B. HALPERN, ESQ.
                                        VALERIE CHU, ESQ.
17
                                        JASON A. FORGE, ESQ.
                                    ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS
                                    880 FRONT STREET
18
                                    SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
19
      FOR DEFENDANT FOGGO:
                                    AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD
                                    BY: MARK J. MAC DOUGALL, ESQ.
20
                                         ANDREW J. DOBER, ESQ.
21
                                    1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., N.W.
                                    WASHINGTON, DC 20036-1564
22
                                    GERAGOS & GERAGOS
     FOR DEFENDANT WILKES:
                                    BY: MARK J. GERAGOS, ESO.
23
                                    350 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE, 39TH FL.
2.4
                                    LOS ANGELES, CA. 90071
25
```

HAVE IT HERE TODAY. I DO HAVE IT. I'M PREPARED TO SUBMIT IT.
BUT I'M VERY RELUCTANT AND UNHAPPY ABOUT ASKING FOR GOVERNMENT
COUNSEL. I HAVE, SINCE AN HOUR AFTER THE HEARING ON THE 9TH
WHEN YOU REMOVED MR. GERAGOS AS MY COUNSEL, BEEN SEEKING
ADVICE AND LOOKING FOR ATTORNEYS JUST IN CASE. I HAVE HAD
DOZENS OF CONVERSATIONS AND E-MAILS. AND NOT ONLY MYSELF, BUT
OTHERS ON MY BEHALF. WE'VE WORKED DILIGENTLY TO FIND SOMEONE
TO REPLACE MR. GERAGOS IN THIS CASE AND TO FIND A WAY TO
PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE.

I FEEL STRONGLY THAT I'D LIKE TO HAVE AT LEAST ONE
LAWYER IN THIS CASE INVOLVED COME FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR AND
NOT BE WITH THE GOVERNMENT. BUT AS YOU'RE AWARE, THERE'S A
NUMBER OF CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THIS CASE, NOT THE LEAST
OF WHICH IS A FINANCIAL SITUATION, WHICH MAKES IT VERY
DIFFICULT TO HAVE A SECOND BEING THE FACT THAT IN THE MINDS OF
EVERY LAWYER I'VE TALKED TO, I'VE BEEN TRIED AND CONVICTED IN
THE PRESS LARGELY AS A RESULT OF LIES AND LEAKS AND
INFORMATION THAT'S BEEN EXCLUDED FROM THE INDICTMENT.

AND SO I FIND MYSELF IN A SITUATION WHERE I'M ASKING FOR HELP AND DEMANDING THAT THEY DO ME A FAVOR QUICKLY. I'M IN A SITUATION WHERE I BELIEVE THAT I CAN FIND COUNSEL TO REPRESENT ME.

THE COURT: I'M SORRY. YOU CAN OR CANNOT?

DEFENDANT WILKES: I CAN, BUT I'M GOING TO NEED MORE

TIME TO DO IT. I THOUGHT -- ON FRIDAY, I THOUGHT THAT I HAD

IT DONE AND THAT I WOULD HAVE SOMEONE HERE TODAY. AND AT 1 2 4:30, I FOUND OUT THAT WASN'T GOING TO BE POSSIBLE. 3 THE COURT: 4:30 YESTERDAY? 4 THE DEFENDANT: 4:30 FRIDAY. 5 BUT I DO NEED A LITTLE MORE TIME. AND I THINK WITH 6 A WEEK OR TEN DAYS, I COULD GET COUNSEL THAT COULD REPRESENT 7 ME THAT I'D BE HAPPY WITH AND THAT COULD DO THE JOB. BUT LIKE 8 I SAID, IT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO ASK FOR A FAVOR AND THEN ASK 9 THEM TO MOVE VERY QUICKLY. 10 WHAT I'VE LEARNED ABOUT DEFENSE LAWYERS IS THEY'RE 11 ALL BUSY. THE ONES THAT AREN'T BUSY ARE THE ONES YOU DON'T 12 WANT TO HIRE. THAT'S BEEN A PROBLEM, JUST GETTING SOMEONE 13 ABLE TO TALK ABOUT IT. 14 THE COURT: YOU MAY HAVE PUT MORE PRESSURE ON YOURSELF THAN WAS NECESSARY. TO BE SURE, I WANTED YOU TO COME 15 16 WITH A LAWYER, AND THAT'S WHY I GAVE TWO WEEKS. I'M SURPRISED 17 THAT YOU COULDN'T FIND SOMEONE WITHIN A TWO-WEEK PERIOD OF 18 TIME. MAYBE THE SECOND CALL TO COME WITH A LAWYER WAS A 19 LITTLE QUICK. BUT I WANT THERE TO BE NO MISUNDERSTANDING. 20 I THINK I MENTIONED THIS BEFORE, MR. WILKES, BUT I 21 CONTEMPLATE THAT WE'RE PROBABLY GOING TO HAVE TO ADJUST THE 22 TRIAL DATE IN THE SECOND CASE. 23 YOU UNDERSTOOD THAT; RIGHT? 2.4 DEFENDANT WILKES: YES. 25 THE COURT: I THINK I SET THAT OCTOBER 24TH,

SOMETHING LIKE THAT. IT'S MARKED OUT ON MY CALENDAR. BUT OBVIOUSLY, WITH ALL OF THE INFORMATION THE GOVERNMENT SAYS THEY WANT A LAWYER REPRESENTING YOU TO REVIEW, SOMEONE'S GOING TO HAVE TO DEVOTE SINGLE-MINDED ATTENTION TO THIS CASE TO BE READY BY THE DATE THAT I SET. AND FEW LAWYERS CAN DO THAT, PARTICULARLY, AS YOU SAY, THE ONES THAT YOU WOULD WANT TO REPRESENT YOU.

SO I'M PREPARED TO ADJUST THAT DATE. BUT, ON THE OTHER HAND, I WANT TO SEE SOME MEASURABLE PROGRESS BY YOU IN GETTING COUNSEL. I KNOW THAT -- AND I DON'T WANT YOU TO COMMENT ON THIS. I KNOW, BECAUSE IT'S BEEN REPRESENTED TO ME, THAT YOU AND MR. GERAGOS HAVE DISCUSSED THIS, THAT HE HAD SOME DISCUSSIONS WITH THE FEDERAL DEFENDER, WHO, BY THE WAY, IS NOT AN ARM OF THE GOVERNMENT. THEY'RE NOT LIKE PUBLIC DEFENDERS. THEY'RE AN INDEPENDENT DEFENDER ORGANIZATION. THEY RECEIVE GOVERNMENT FUNDS, BUT THEY DO THEIR OWN HIRING. THE COURTS AND THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NO SAY ON THAT.

THE FEDERAL DEFENDERS ORGANIZATION HERE IS

INDEPENDENT. THEY'RE NOT LIKE A PUBLIC DEFENDER. THEY DO GET

GOVERNMENT FUNDS, IF THAT'S WHAT YOU MEAN BY "GOVERNMENT

LAWYERS." THEY'RE GOVERNMENT LAWYERS UNDER THAT DEFINITION.

BUT THEY HAVE -- IN ALL MY TIME HERE, HAVE PRIDED THEMSELVES

ON THEIR INDEPENDENCE, THAT NO ONE TELLS THEM WHAT TO DO.

IN FACT, I THINK EVEN AS LONG AS I'VE BEEN HERE, THE SUPERVISORS HAVE BEEN VERY RELUCTANT TO REIN IN INDIVIDUAL

LAWYERS OVER THERE. I THINK THAT'S PART OF THE LURE FOR YOUNG
PEOPLE COMING OUT OF LAW SCHOOL OR MOVING FROM A FIRM TO A
PUBLIC DEFENDER ORGANIZATION TO GO TO THAT FIRM. THEY HAVE
MANY FINE LAWYERS THAT ARE VERY EXPERIENCED PEOPLE.

SO THEY ARE THE TYPES OF LAWYERS, IF YOU QUALIFY,
THAT YOU WOULD WANT TO HAVE DEFEND YOU IN A CASE LIKE THIS.
BUT I RESPECT YOUR RIGHT TO PICK A LAWYER OF YOUR CHOOSING.
AND IF YOU CAN AFFORD TO DO SO, I'M PREPARED TO GIVE YOU SOME
MORE TIME. BUT WE CAN'T GO ON AND ON. WE'VE GOT ANOTHER
FELLOW WHO HAS AN INTEREST IN A SPEEDY TRIAL, TOO. MR. FOGGO,
HE'S AHEAD OF YOU BECAUSE HIS LAWYERS WENT THROUGH THIS
CLEARANCE. AND THEY HAVE BEEN REVIEWING THE MATERIALS.

AND THE CASE IS NOT SEVERED BETWEEN YOU AND HIM, AS YOU KNOW. THE TWO OF YOU, UNLESS SOMETHING COMES UP THAT PERSUADES ME IT SHOULD BE SEPARATED, WILL BE TRIED TOGETHER.

AND WE MOVE AT THE PACE OF THE SLOWEST SHIP IN THE CONVOY. IF YOU'RE NOT MOVING VERY QUICKLY, THEN HIS CASE CAN'T ADVANCE EITHER. AND I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THAT.

SO IT'S INCUMBENT UPON YOU TO DEVOTE YOUR ATTENTION TO THIS PROBLEM. I KNOW YOU'VE GOT A LOT OF BALLS UP IN THE AIR. I KNOW THERE'S A LOT OF THINGS GOING ON. BUT YOUR ATTENTION NEEDS TO BE DEVOTED TO THIS PROBLEM. YOU NEED TO GET A LAWYER AND COME BACK WITH A LAWYER WHO'S PREPARED TO REPRESENT YOU ON THIS.

BUT THE LONGER IT GOES, MR. WILKES, THE LESS LIKELY

2.4

THE COURT: DO YOU WANT TO SUBMIT YOUR FINANCIAL

AFFIDAVIT TO ME TODAY SO I CAN REVIEW THAT? DO YOU BELIEVE

YOU QUALIFY FOR APPOINTED COUNSEL AT THIS POINT?

DEFENDANT WILKES: I HAVE NO IDEA. THIS IS -- I

23

2.4

1 DON'T KNOW.

THE COURT: WELL, IT MIGHT MAKE SENSE FOR YOU TO SUBMIT THAT. THE ONLY PERSON THAT SEES IT IS ME. IT WOULD REMAIN SEALED. BUT AT LEAST WE'D BE IN A POSITION WHERE I WOULDN'T HAVE TO TAKE TIME TO DO THE REVIEW OF THAT IN THE EVENT YOU'RE NOT ABLE TO COME UP WITH YOUR OWN COUNSEL.

TODAY IS THE 31ST {SIC}. TEN DAYS PUTS US OUT ABOUT
THE 10TH. I DON'T WANT TO GO ANY LONGER THAN THAT. AND IF
YOU CAN COME UP WITH SOMEBODY BEFORE THE 10TH --

THE CLERK: TODAY IS THE 30TH. I'M SORRY.

WELL, LET'S -- EVERY DAY COUNTS AT THIS POINT.

WHAT ABOUT THE 8TH OF AUGUST? WOULD YOU BE AVAILABLE TO COME BACK ON THE 8TH? THAT'S A WEEK FROM WEDNESDAY.

DEFENDANT WILKES: YES.

THE COURT: DO YOU THINK YOU CAN MAKE YOUR

ARRANGEMENTS OR FINALIZE SOME ARRANGEMENTS WITH SOMEONE BY

THEN IF THAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN?

DEFENDANT WILKES: YES, I CERTAINLY HOPE SO. IF NOT, I'LL CERTAINLY KNOW THAT I'M NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO.

THE COURT: WE'LL SET THIS OVER AGAIN FOR THE 8TH UNTIL 10:00 IN THE MORNING. AND THAT'S JUST FOR YOU TO TELL ME WHO COUNSEL IS.

YOU SEE, THE PROBLEM IS -- AND I KNOW YOU KNOW

THIS -- I CAN'T SET ANY OF THE OTHER DATES IN THIS CASE THAT

2.4

NEED TO BE SET BECAUSE I'VE GOT TO HAVE SOMEBODY HERE WHO CAN GIVE ME A GOOD FAITH ESTIMATE OF HOW LONG IT WILL TAKE THEM TO GET UP TO SPEED. I WANT YOU TO SUBMIT THE FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT TODAY. MR. GERAGOS REPRESENTED LAST TIME THAT HE HAD TALKED TO SOME PEOPLE AT THE FEDERAL DEFENDERS OFFICE. IN THE EVENT YOU DON'T COME WITH COUNSEL ON THE 8TH, IT WOULD BE MY INCLINATION AT THIS POINT TO APPOINT COUNSEL FOR YOU.

I'M GOING TO LOOK AT THE AFFIDAVIT AND MAKE SURE
YOU'RE QUALIFIED FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL. IN IFFY
SITUATIONS, I'M STILL ENTITLED TO APPOINT COUNSEL WITH THE
PROVISO THAT YOU'D HAVE TO PAY FOR THE COST OF THAT
REPRESENTATION. WE'D HAVE A HEARING AT THE END. AND IF I
DETERMINED THAT YOU WERE FINANCIALLY ABLE TO PAY FOR THE COST
OF REPRESENTATION, THEN YOU'D HAVE TO PAY FOR THAT JUST AS YOU
WOULD A PRIVATE LAWYER.

I WANT TO GIVE YOU EVERY OPPORTUNITY, MR. WILKES, TO FIND COUNSEL OF YOUR OWN CHOOSING. YOU'RE ENTITLED TO THAT IF YOU CAN AFFORD THAT. BUT NOW TIME IS BECOMING A FACTOR HERE. SO ON THE 8TH, ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE COUNSEL FOR YOU. I'LL DIRECT YOU TO FILE THE FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT TODAY.

MR. MAC DOUGALL, MR. DOBER, AND MR. TESLIK, I THINK
WHAT THAT MEANS IS WE CAN'T GO FORWARD AND SET THE MOTIONS

DATES THAT I HAD INTENDED TO SET IN THE FOGGO MATTER UNTIL WE
CONFIRM COUNSEL FOR MR. WILKES. I'M SORRY ABOUT THAT, BUT I'M

2.4

STUCK AT THIS POINT UNLESS YOU HAVE SOME SUGGESTION. IF

THERE'S SOME DATE THAT I CAN SET RESPECTING THE CIPA MATERIAL

THAT YOU'VE HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT, I MIGHT BE WILLING TO

CONSIDER DOING THAT.

MR. MAC DOUGALL: MARK MAC DOUGALL.

WE SENT EARLIER TODAY AN EX PARTE LETTER TO THE COURT, WHICH YOUR HONOR PROBABLY HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT YET. THE SUBJECT MATTER OF IT RELATES DIRECTLY TO THE AMOUNT OF TIME THAT'S BEING EXPENDED AND REALLY THE DELAY THAT WE BELIEVE IS BEING CAUSED BY THE CIA IN MAKING SORT OF BASIC INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO US AND ACCESS TO WITNESSES.

SO IN ORDER TO MAKE THE AUGUST DATE PRODUCTIVE, IF WE COULD ASK THE COURT TO HEAR US ON THAT EX PARTE MATTER BETWEEN NOW AND THEN, I THINK IT WOULD HELP MAKE THAT DATE A USEFUL DATE.

THE COURT: I'LL DO THAT.

I HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT IT YET. I HAVEN'T EVEN SEEN IT.

BUT ARE YOU STILL RUNNING INTO THE SAME TYPES OF
PROBLEMS WITH THE AGENCY REFUSING TO LET YOU INTERVIEW PEOPLE
YOU THINK ARE PERTINENT?

MR. MAC DOUGALL: YES, YOUR HONOR. I CAN GIVE YOU SOME PARTS OF IT. I'D RATHER NOT SPEAK IN OPEN COURT. BUT SPECIFICALLY, WE'VE ADDRESSED ONE OF THEM PREVIOUSLY. WE'VE HAD TO BE READ INTO SPECIALIZED COMPARTMENTS, SCI'S, SINCE

2.4

JUNE 29TH. AND THE COURT DIRECTED ON JULY 9TH THE CIA DEPUTY

GENERAL COUNSEL TO TAKE UP PROFFERS, WHICH THEY DID A FEW DAYS

LATER. IT'S NOW BEEN NEARLY TWO WEEKS SINCE THEY TOOK THE

PROFFER AND SAID, "WE'LL GET BACK TO YOU."

I MYSELF CAN'T IMAGINE A THEORY UNDER WHICH THEY
COULD DENY US ACCESS TO THOSE COMPARTMENTS RECOGNIZING THAT
ALL THAT DOES IS GIVE US THE RIGHT TO GO OUT AND LOOK FOR
INFORMATION, NOT THE RIGHT TO OBTAIN ANYTHING. SO IF IT'S
TAKEN US A MONTH TO SIMPLY GET AN EXTRA SECURITY CLEARANCE
THAT I DON'T THINK THERE'S GOING TO BE ANY DOUBT WE'RE
ENTITLED TO, I DON'T KNOW HOW WE'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO MOVE
FORWARD AND SET A TRIAL DATE UNLESS THAT LOG JAM IS BROKEN.
AND THAT'S WHAT WE'RE ASKING THE COURT TO ASSIST US IN DOING.

THE COURT: WE WILL SET THAT FOR THE 8TH AS WELL.

MR. FORGE, I THINK IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE THAT YOU HAVE A REPRESENTATIVE. I KNOW ONE IS HERE, BUT THAT YOU HAVE A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE CIA HERE ON THAT DAY.

MR. FORGE: WE'LL ARRANGE IT AT LEAST TELEPHONICALLY.

THE COURT: MR. MAC DOUGALL IS RIGHT. I ASKED AND WAS ASSURED THAT THEY WOULD DO EVERYTHING THAT THEY COULD.

I'M -- AT THIS POINT, I HAVEN'T READ IT. BUT I WOULD TEND TO BE DEFERENTIAL IN MY THINKING TO EXPERIENCED DEFENSE COUNSEL SAYING HE BELIEVES HE'S ENTITLED TO THIS. SO YOU MIGHT COMMUNICATE THAT TO THE CIA AS WELL. THEY'RE DELAYING THIS

TRIAL FROM GOING FORWARD.

2.4

MR. FORGE: YOUR HONOR, I DO WANT TO SAY OBVIOUSLY
WE'RE NOT INVOLVED IN THOSE DISCUSSIONS. BUT I JUST WANT TO
FORECAST FOR YOUR HONOR. I UNDERSTAND THAT THE OFFICE OF
GENERAL COUNSEL WILL BE FILING AN EX PARTE RESPONSE TO MORE
FULLY EXPLAIN TO THE COURT THE FULL CONTEXT OF THEIR THINKING.

I KNOW THAT FROM OUR DEALINGS WITH THEM IN GENERAL IN THIS CASE, WE HAVE NEVER HAD EVEN A SUSPICION THAT THEY WERE INTENDING TO DELAY ANYTHING AND THAT THEY HAVE ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE COUNTRY IN THIS CASE IN MIND IN MAKING THEIR DECISIONS.

THE COURT: WHY WOULD IT TAKE TWO WEEKS, THOUGH,

MR. FORGE. THEY GOT A SPECIFIC REQUEST. WHY WOULD IT TAKE

THEM TWO WEEKS AND STILL NO RESPONSE TO THAT SPECIFIC REQUEST?

EITHER THEY SAY -- THEY LOOK AT IT AND THEY SAY "NO, WE CAN'T

DO THIS" OR "YES, WE WILL" AND THEN RESPOND.

MR. FORGE: AGAIN, WE'RE NOT PRIVY TO THOSE

CONVERSATIONS. I DON'T WANT TO SPECULATE ABOUT IT. ALL I'M

SAYING IS AS WITH ANY SITUATION, THERE ARE TWO SIDES TO THE

STORY. IT WILL BE INTERESTING TO SEE WHAT THEY DO HAVE TO SAY

IN RESPONSE.

THE COURT: THAT MATTER WILL BE SET FOR THE 8TH.

I'LL WANT SOME EXPLANATION FROM THE CIA AS TO THE SPECIFIC

CLAIMS THAT WILL BE BROUGHT UP ON THAT DAY. YOU'VE GOT AN

IDEA OF WHAT THE NATURE OF THE CLAIMS ARE.

MR. MAC DOUGALL OR MR. FORGE, ANYTHING ELSE THAT WE 1 2 CAN DO ON THE WILKES/FOGGO MATTER? 3 MR. MAC DOUGALL: YOUR HONOR, I MISSED PART OF 4 THAT. 5 THE COURT: I SAID IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THAT WE 6 CAN DO, ANY OTHER DATES OR PROGRESS THAT CAN BE MADE TODAY AS 7 FAR AS EITHER SIDE IS CONCERNED ON THE WILKES/FOGGO MATTER? 8 MR. MAC DOUGALL: I'M AFRAID NOT, YOUR HONOR. WE'RE 9 AS READY TO MOVE FORWARD AS THE COURT IS BUT WITHOUT 10 ESTABLISHING SOME KIND OF FULL COOPERATION WITH THE CIA, I 11 DON'T KNOW THAT WE'RE IN A POSITION TO DO THAT. 12 THE COURT: MR. WILKES, BEFORE I CLOSE OUT ON THIS CASE, IF YOU'LL PRESENT THE DECLARATION TO THE CLERK OF THE 13 14 COURT HERE. 15 MR. FORGE: YOUR HONOR, I DO WANT TO SAY REGARDING 16 THE FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT, IT'S NOT NECESSARILY A BATTLE WE HAVE 17 TO FIGHT. BUT TO THE EXTENT THAT WHEN WE COME HERE NEXT WEEK, 18 YOUR HONOR IS INCLINED TO ACCEPT THEIR REPRESENTATIONS THAT HE 19 QUALIFIES FOR APPOINTED COUNSEL, IT IS THE UNITED STATES' 20 POSITION THAT WE WOULD HAVE A RIGHT OF ACCESS TO THAT 21 DOCUMENT. AGAIN, I'M NOT TRYING TO ARGUE IT RIGHT NOW. 22 THE COURT: I DON'T THINK WE NEED TO GET TO THAT NOW 23 EITHER. THE PURPOSE OF HIM PRESENTING THIS DOCUMENT TO ME IS FOR ME TO MAKE A DETERMINATION OF WHETHER HE QUALIFIES FOR 2.4 25 APPOINTED COUNSEL IN THE EVENT HE CAN'T FIND SOMEONE TO

REPRESENT HIM.

2.4

EVEN IF IT'S CLOSE, MR. FORGE, AS YOU KNOW, I HAVE DISCRETION UNDER 3006(A) OF TITLE 18 TO APPOINT COUNSEL WITH THE PROVISO THAT WE'D HAVE A HEARING AT THE END AND THAT THE COSTS COULD BE ASSESSED AGAINST MR. WILKES'S IN THE EVENT THAT I FIND HE'S FINANCIALLY ABLE AT THAT POINT. AT THIS TIME, MY INTEREST IS IN MOVING THIS CASE FORWARD.

MR. FORGE: THAT'S WHY I'M NOT TRYING TO MAKE AN ISSUE OUT OF IT NOW. I DON'T WANT YOUR HONOR TO THINK IF WE STOOD SILENT TODAY, THAT IT'S A BELATED ARGUMENT.

THE COURT: YOU CAN RESERVE ANY ARGUMENT YOU HAVE WITH RESPECT TO THIS. FOR NOW, I'VE RECEIVED IT UNDER SEAL FROM HIM. AND IT'S, AS I SAID, FOR THE PURPOSE OF EVALUATING HIS FINANCIAL SITUATION.

THE DEFENDANT: I HAVEN'T HAD THAT REVIEWED BY AN ATTORNEY OR ASKED ANYONE ABOUT THE POTENTIAL RISK OF DELIVERING IT TO YOU BASED ON THE REPRESENTATION THAT THAT WAS THE SOLE PURPOSE FOR IT AND THAT WAS ALL IT WOULD BE USED FOR.

THE COURT: BEFORE I TURN IT OVER TO ANYBODY, I'LL MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE COUNSEL, WHETHER APPOINTED OR COUNSEL OF YOUR CHOOSING, TO GET A COPY OF THIS AND LOOK AT IT. THERE WILL BE ARGUMENTS THAT CAN BE MADE ON BOTH SIDES. I'M NOT INCLINED TO TURN IT OVER, MR. WILKES.

OKAY. LET'S SWITCH GEARS NOW.

ON THE WILKES/MICHAEL MATTER, WE HAVE A TRIAL DATE 1 2 SET FOR SEPTEMBER 18TH. I NOTICED, IN GOING BACK AND LOOKING 3 AT THE DOCKET IN THE CASE, THAT I HAD SET A MOTIONS IN LIMINE 4 FOR THE 17TH OF SEPTEMBER. AND IT APPEARED FROM THE DOCKET 5 ENTRY THAT THAT WAS ALSO THE DATE FOR HEARING ANY SUBSTANTIVE 6 MOTIONS. 7 IS THAT THE RECOLLECTION OF COUNSEL AS WELL? 8 MR. GRANGER: I'M SORRY. I DIDN'T HEAR THAT LAST 9 SENTENCE. 10 THE COURT: MR. GRANGER, THAT WAS THE DATE FOR 11 HEARING PRE-TRIAL MOTIONS, SUBSTANTIVE IN NATURE, AS WELL AS 12 IN LIMINE MOTIONS ON THE 17TH. 13 IS THAT THE WAY THAT WE SET IT? 14 MR. GRANGER: YOU DID NOT SET ANY PRIOR DATES. 15 THAT'S CORRECT. 16 MR. FORGE: I THINK WE'VE HAD OUR SUBSTANTIVE MOTION 17 HEARING DATE, YOUR HONOR. THAT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING BEFORE. 18 I THINK WE HAD MULTIPLE HEARING DATES. I THINK YOUR HONOR 19 SPECIFICALLY SET A DATE FOR SUBSTANTIVE MOTIONS. 20 THE COURT: HAS THAT COME AND GONE? 21 MR. FORGE: I BELIEVE SO. 22 MR. HALPERN: WE HAD ARGUMENTS, SEVERAL HOURS' WORTH 23 OF ARGUMENTS ON A WIDE RANGE OF MOTIONS THAT WERE FILED ON 2.4 BOTH SIDES. THE GOVERNMENT, IN BOTH CASES, RESPONDED TO 25 VOLUMINOUS MOTIONS IN THIS CASE.

THE COURT: MR. GRANGER OR MR. GERAGOS, ARE THERE 1 2 OTHER -- I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT IN LIMINE MOTIONS. ARE THERE 3 OTHER PRE-TRIAL SUBSTANTIVE MOTIONS THAT EITHER ONE OF YOU 4 INTENDS TO BRING? 5 MR. GRANGER: THIS IS RAYMOND GRANGER. 6 AT THE LAST APPEARANCE -- I BELIEVE IT WAS 7 MAY 14TH -- THIS WAS ADDRESSED WITH RESPECT TO MR. MICHAEL'S 8 CASE. YOUR HONOR SPECIFICALLY DID NOT SET A DEADLINE. WITH 9 THAT IN MIND, WE CERTAINLY DON'T INTEND TO BE FILING 10 SUBSTANTIVE MOTIONS ON SEPTEMBER 17TH. BUT ACTUALLY, WE ARE 11 IN THE PROCESS OF PREPARING SOME VERY DETAILED MOTIONS THAT WE 12 HOPE TO BE FILING VERY SOON. 13 THE COURT: WHAT'S THE NATURE OF THE MOTIONS THAT 14 YOU INTEND TO FILE OTHER THAN IN LIMINE MOTIONS? 15 MR. GRANGER: WELL, WE HAVE AT LEAST ONE OR TWO 16 GROUNDS FOR POSSIBLE DISMISSAL. THEY'RE SOMEWHAT SENSITIVE. 17 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IT'S ENOUGH THAT I KNOW THAT THAT'S THE NATURE OF IT. IT'S A MOTION TO DISMISS. 18 19 ANYTHING ELSE? 20 MR. GRANGER: MR. LEVITT AND I ARE ACTUALLY MAKING 21 THAT DECISION THIS WEEK, DECISIONS ON MOTIONS. 22 THE COURT: MR. GERAGOS, HOW ABOUT YOU? DO YOU HAVE 23 ANY OTHER SUBSTANTIVE MOTIONS TO FILE ON BEHALF OF MR. WILKES 2.4 IN THE WILKES/MICHAEL CASE? 25 MR. GERAGOS: WE BELIEVE WE WILL, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WELL, IT SOUNDS, MR. HALPERN, AS IF I NEED TO SET ANOTHER DATE. IT WAS UNCLEAR IN MY RECOLLECTION ABOUT WHETHER I SET A CUTOFF DATE FOR PRE-TRIAL MOTIONS. KNOW WE GOT SOME. I REMEMBER. OBVIOUSLY, WE GOT THE MOTION DIRECTED AT THE GRAND JURY -- ALLEGATION OF A GRAND JURY LEAK. IT'S UNCLEAR IN MY NOTES AND IN THE DOCKET WHETHER I SET A FINAL DATE FOR DISPOSITIVE PRE-TRIAL MOTIONS. MR. HALPERN IS RIGHT THAT I HAVE HEARD MOTIONS RESPECTING THE WILKES/MICHAEL INDICTMENT. I'VE RULED ON SOME OF THOSE, BUT I DON'T RECALL IF I SET A FINAL CUTOFF DATE. MR. GRANGER: MY RECOLLECTION IS QUITE FIRM. YOU DID NOT. MR. HALPERN: YOUR HONOR, I THINK THAT WOULD BE CLEAR, THAT THE COURT NEVER RULED AND SAID, "THIS IS IT. MORE MOTIONS WILL BE FILED." HOWEVER, THE PRACTICE IN THIS COURT AND VIRTUALLY EVERY OTHER COURT I'VE EVER BEEN IN IN THIS COURTHOUSE HAS BEEN WE SET A MOTIONS DATE. ON THAT DATE, ALL THE MOTIONS ARE HEARD. AGAIN, I'M NOT TRYING TO SAY IF THERE'S A MOTION THEY HAD AND THEY DIDN'T UNDERSTAND THAT THEY WAIVED IT, IT'S JUST AFTER SPENDING HOURS, YOUR HONOR --MR. GRANGER: WE'RE FADING IN AND OUT A LITTLE BIT. THE COURT: MR. HALPERN, MAYBE YOU CAN STAND AT THE LECTERN AND SPEAK INTO THE MIKE. I THINK THAT WILL HELP. I'LL HAVE MR. HALPERN START RIGHT OVER.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

THE PRACTICE IN MY COURT AND OTHER COURTS IN THIS DISTRICT IS
TO SET A SINGLE DATE IN MOST CIRCUMSTANCES FOR HEARING
PRE-TRIAL MOTIONS, NOT TO BIFURCATE IT. I, IN PARTICULAR,
DON'T LIKE TO DO THAT. I LIKE TO GET READY FOR THE MOTION
HEARING AND THEN HEAR ALL THE MOTIONS ON A CASE AT ONCE.

I UNDERSTAND UNDER SOME CIRCUMSTANCES THAT'S NOT
POSSIBLE. DISCOVERY IS LATE OR FACTS BECOME KNOWN THAT WERE
NOT KNOWN AT THE TIME THAT THE PARTY WAS OBLIGATED TO FILE
MOTIONS. IN MOST INSTANCES, I DO REQUIRE THAT ALL THE MOTIONS
BE FILED SO AS TO BE HEARD ON A DATE CERTAIN. I'M NOT SURE I
MADE THAT CLEAR IN THIS CASE, THOUGH, MR. HALPERN.

MR. HALPERN: I UNDERSTAND THAT. I DON'T THINK I
COULD HAVE ARTICULATED IT BETTER THAN THE COURT DID. THAT'S
OUR ROUTINE PRACTICE HERE. AFTER SPENDING HOURS AND HOURS
PREPARING AND RESPONDING TO MOTIONS, I DIDN'T THINK WE WERE
GOING TO HAVE ROLLING MOTION DATES. I DON'T THINK I'VE HEARD
FROM ANY JUDGE IN THIS COURTHOUSE "WELL, THIS IS IT, COUNSEL.
IT'S THE FINAL DATE." I THINK IT'S UNDERSTOOD BY ALL THE
PARTIES.

WHEN WE LOOK AT THE RULES, THERE'S A DATE FOR MOTIONS. AND THOSE DATES ARE HELD BY ALL THE COURTS HERE.

THAT'S STATED. IF THERE WERE NEW MOTIONS BASED ON NEWLY DISCOVERED INFORMATION, THE GOVERNMENT, OF COURSE, RECOGNIZES IT'S APPROPRIATE FOR THEM TO BE BROUGHT.

2.4

AND WHAT'S TROUBLING TO THE GOVERNMENT, YOUR HONOR, 1 2 IS SIMPLY THAT WE ARE WORKING UNDER A SHORT TIME FRAME. WE'VE 3 SPENT HOURS DOING THIS. WE NOW WOULD RATHER SPEND OUR TIME 4 PREPARING FOR TRIAL AND NOT BE LABORING UNDER ANOTHER 5 AVALANCHE OF MOTIONS. 6 THE COURT: THAT WOULD RESONATE WITH ME MORE IF YOU 7 WERE STANDING HERE ALONE. 8 MR. HALPERN: WELL, IT'S TRUE WE HAVE INDIVIDUALS 9 WHO CAN DO THIS. BUT WE ALL HAVE OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES, AS THE COURT KNOWS. WE HAVE MULTIPLE TRIALS THAT WE'RE FACING, 10 11 WHICH THE COURT KNOWS AS WELL, WHICH WE'RE TRYING TO 12 ACCOMMODATE, NOT ONLY THIS COURT, BUT OTHER JUDGES IN THIS 13 COURTHOUSE. 14 MR. GRANGER: WE FADED OUT AGAIN. THE COURT: ARE YOU BACK AGAIN? 15 16 MR. GRANGER: YES. 17 THE COURT: MR. HALPERN WAS TELLING ME HOW BUSY HE 18 AND THE OTHER PROSECUTORS WERE. HE NEGLECTED TO MENTION 19 THEY'RE ALSO PURSUING WRITS. SO THEY'RE ACTIVE IN TWO COURTS 20 AT THE SAME TIME. 21 ALL THAT SAID, I THINK IT'S APPROPRIATE THAT I SET A 22 DATE FOR FILING OF THESE INTENDED MOTIONS AND A DATE ON WHICH 23 THEY'LL BE HEARD. 24 MR. GRANGER, YOU SAY YOU'RE ABOUT READY TO -- YOU'VE

GOT ONE DONE, AND YOU'RE CONTEMPLATING A SECOND ONE I'M

2.4

ASSUMING CAN BE DONE IN FAIRLY SHORT ORDER, CAN BE PREPARED AND FILED?

MR. GRANGER: THIS IS THE SITUATION, JUST TO ADD SOME BACKGROUND TO THE COMMENTS BY THE COURT AND MR. HALPERN.

I BELIEVE THAT YOUR HONOR HAS NOT SET DATES IN CONSIDERATION FOR THE FACT THAT I WAS NEW COUNSEL. NOW, WITH RESPECT TO THE MOTION FOR FILING OF THE DISCOVERY, THE GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN SENDING ME A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF INFORMATION, AND I APPRECIATE THEIR EFFORTS IN THAT REGARD.

BUT PART OF THE PROBLEM WE'VE HAD IS THAT THE

GOVERNMENT THOUGHT THAT WITHIN APPROXIMATELY TWO WEEKS OF THE

MAY 14TH DATE, I WOULD BE RECEIVING ALL INFORMATION IT HAD IN

ITS POSSESSION AT THAT TIME. THE UNDERSTANDING WAS THAT GOING

FORWARD, I WOULD GET THE DISCOVERY ON A ROLLING BASIS.

AND THE REALITY IS I'M STILL GETTING -- AND WHEN I SAY "STILL GETTING," AS OF LAST WEEK, I'M STILL GETTING DOCUMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN IN THE GOVERNMENT'S POSSESSION FOR A YEAR AND A HALF. I UNDERSTAND THE PRODUCTION IS VOLUMINOUS. WHEN I SAY THAT, I'M REALLY NOT COMPLAINING. I DON'T MEAN TO CRITICIZE THE GOVERNMENT IN THAT REGARD. THEY HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO MEET THAT COMMITMENT OF LATE MAY.

BUT THAT'S PART OF THE PROBLEM WITH RESPECT TO SOME OF THE MOTIONS, THE INFORMATION WE'RE GETTING. AND IT'S DIFFICULT NOT TO TELL WHERE WE'RE GOING IN SOME REGARDS BY ASKING THE GOVERNMENT TO PRODUCE CERTAIN THINGS THAT WE THINK

1 ARE OUT THERE.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

21

THAT SAID, YOUR HONOR, I WANT TO TELL YOU THAT WITH RESPECT TO OUR PLANS ON MOTIONS AND THE UPCOMING ARGUMENT BEFORE THE 9TH CIRCUIT WHICH, UNFORTUNATELY, WE STILL HAVE NOT GOTTEN CLARIFICATION ON FROM THE CIRCUIT WHETHER OUR MOTION TO INTERVENE IS GOING TO BE GRANTED, WHAT MR. MICHAEL AND I HAVE PLANNED ON DOING IS IF WE DID NOT RECEIVE THE MATERIALS THAT WE NEED TO FINISH OUR EXAMINATION WITH RESPECT TO MOTIONS -- WE WERE GOING TO DO THAT IF WE GET MOTIONS GRANTED AND WE'RE OUT THERE ON THE 6TH, WE WERE GOING TO COME DOWN TO SAN DIEGO ON THE 7TH AND GO THROUGH DISCOVERY AND TRY TO CHERRY-PICK OUT WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AND WAITING FOR. THE FBI HAS BEEN VERY ACCOMMODATING IN THAT REGARD, IN MAKING MATERIALS AVAILABLE. WHAT I WOULD ASK, JUDGE, WITH THAT IN MIND, PERHAPS IF WE COULD HAVE MOTIONS DUE THAT FRIDAY THE 10TH.

THE COURT: MR. GERAGOS, DOES THAT WORK FOR YOU AS WELL?

18 MR. GERAGOS: I'D ACTUALLY LIKE TO HAVE IT A WEEK
19 AFTER THAT, IF I COULD.

THE COURT: THE 17TH?

MR. GERAGOS: ON THE 17TH.

THE COURT: WELL, UNFORTUNATELY, THAT LEAVES ME WITH

23 A LITTLE LESS TIME.

24 HOW ABOUT THE 15TH, MR. GERAGOS, WEDNESDAY THE 15TH?

MR. GERAGOS: THAT'S FINE, YOUR HONOR.

FOR MR. MICHAEL DUE NO LATER THAN CLOSE OF BUSINESS ON THE 15TH OF AUGUST.

GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE IS DUE NO LATER THAN NOON ON THE 29TH. THE MOTIONS WILL BE HEARD AT 3:00 P.M. ON SEPTEMBER 4TH. I'LL CONFIRM THE MOTION IN LIMINE DATE ON THE WILKES/MICHAEL CASE FOR THE 17TH.

I'LL HEAR MOTIONS IN LIMINE IN THE AFTERNOON AT 2:00. THEN TRIAL WILL BEGIN ON THE 18TH. WE CAN TALK ON THE 4TH ABOUT AN INTERMEDIATE DATE FOR TALKING ABOUT THE RESPONSE TO THE JURY QUESTIONNAIRE.

I SPOKE WITH THE JURY ADMINISTRATOR TODAY, AND MY UNDERSTANDING IS WE'RE GOING TO GET THE JOINT SUBMISSION FOR A QUESTIONNAIRE SOMETIME THIS AFTERNOON?

MR. FORGE: THAT'S CORRECT.

MR. GRANGER: WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO AGREE PROBABLY ON 95 PERCENT OF THE QUESTIONS.

THE COURT: I'LL LOOK AT THE REST OF IT. AND WE INTEND TO SEND IT OUT RIGHT AWAY. THE JURY ADMINISTRATOR SAYS SHE NEEDS FOUR WEEKS TO GET THE RESPONSES BACK. MY INTENTION WOULD BE AS SOON AS THOSE COME BACK, TO TURN THEM OVER AND WE CAN SET A DATE TO ACCOMPLISH WHAT WE CAN WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRES IN ADVANCE.

AND IF WE NEED ANOTHER INTERMEDIATE DATE TO TALK TO CERTAIN PROSPECTIVE JURORS, I WOULD SET THAT BETWEEN THE 4TH AND THE 18TH. MY PLAN IS ON THE 18TH TO HAVE A LARGER THAN

2.4

2.4

NORMAL PANEL. USUALLY, I BRING IN 35 OR 36 PROSPECTIVE

JURORS. I WOULD PROBABLY BRING IN MAYBE 60 IN THIS CASE.

I'LL TALK TO YOU ABOUT THAT MORE ON THE 4TH. BUT TO

PRE-SCREEN THOSE PEOPLE NOT ONLY FOR TIME, BUT TO HAVE THEM

ANSWER THE QUESTIONNAIRES AS WELL.

SO WE CAN TAKE THAT UP AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE FURTHER ON THAT ACCOUNT ON THE 4TH. AND YOU CAN EXPECT SOMETIME BEFORE THEN THE QUESTIONNAIRE WILL GO OUT, AND WE'LL HAVE RESPONSES BACK -- PROBABLY BACK BY THE 4TH OR THEREABOUTS.

MR. GRANGER: THIS IS RAYMOND GRANGER.

IN DISCUSSING THE JURY QUESTIONNAIRE WITH GOVERNMENT COUNSEL AND COUNSEL FOR MR. WILKES, WE HAD ALL COME TO THE SAME CONCLUSION. WE WANT TO PUT THIS BEFORE THE COURT.

WE HAVE SOME CONCERN WITH RESPECT TO JURORS WHO MAY BE A LITTLE BIT TOO ANXIOUS -- I SHOULD SAY POTENTIAL JURORS WHO ARE A LITTLE BIT TOO ANXIOUS TO BE JURORS. WE THOUGHT PERHAPS THE PRUDENT THING TO DO WOULD BE TO SUBMIT THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO YOUR HONOR IN CHAMBERS RATHER THAN FILING IT VIA VTF WHERE THOSE JURORS -- OR I SHOULD SAY, AGAIN, THOSE POTENTIAL JURORS WHO MAY, IN OUR VIEW -- AND NOT JUST MY VIEW, MR. GERAGOS'S VIEW AND THAT OF GOVERNMENT COUNSEL -- MIGHT BE A LITTLE BIT TOO ANXIOUS TO FIND OUT WHAT THE QUESTIONS ARE. THAT WOULD BE OUR SUGGESTION, IS THAT WE SUBMIT IT DIRECTLY TO CHAMBERS.

THE COURT: THE VALUE OF THAT IS WHAT, THAT WE DON'T
TIP YOUR HAND AS TO WHAT THE QUESTIONS ARE GOING TO BE TO SOME
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WHO MAY LATER BE SUMMONED AS A
PROSPECTIVE JUROR?

MR. GRANGER: YES, JUDGE. AND THEY HAVE TIME TO THINK ABOUT ANSWERING THE QUESTION IN A PARTICULAR WAY SO AS TO INCREASE THAT JUROR'S LIKELIHOOD OF BEING CHOSEN AS A JUROR.

THE COURT: I'M -- IT DOESN'T RESONATE WITH ME VERY MUCH, MR. GRANGER. BECAUSE I THINK SOMEONE WHO'S INCLINED TO BE ON THE JURY IS SMART ENOUGH WITHIN PROBABLY A HALF-HOUR'S CONTEMPLATION TO FIGURE OUT WHAT HE OR SHE HAS TO SAY. I'M NOT INCLINED TO MAKE MORE THINGS SECRET ABOUT THESE PROCEEDINGS. AS I SAID, I'VE BEEN CHASTENED ABOUT THAT ALREADY. SO I DON'T KNOW. I APPRECIATE THAT ALL COUNSEL WOULD LIKE ME TO DO IT THAT WAY. I JUST CAN'T FIND A LEGAL BASIS FOR SEALING THAT AT THIS POINT.

IT'S GOING TO GO OUT. WHEN THE FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE
IS RECEIVED, I IMAGINE SOMEBODY IS GOING TO REPORT IT IF
THERE'S PRESS INTEREST IN IT. SO IT WOULD BE OUT OF THE BAG
WITHIN A WEEK OR DAYS OF MAILING AND RECEIPT BY SOME
PROSPECTIVE JUROR ANYWAY.

MR. FORGE: THE GOVERNMENT DOESN'T HAVE A STRONG
POSITION ON THIS ISSUE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER. IT'S FINE WITH
US. OBVIOUSLY, THE FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE, WHATEVER THE COURT

2.4

1 APPROVES, I DON'T THINK --

2.4

MR. GRANGER: SORRY TO INTERRUPT. MR. FORGE IS FADING OUT A LITTLE BIT.

THE COURT: I'LL HAVE HIM SPEAK AT THE MIKE AGAIN.

MR. FORGE: YOUR HONOR, JUST TO REITERATE, THE

GOVERNMENT DOESN'T HAVE A STRONG POSITION ON THIS ISSUE ONE

WAY OR THE OTHER. I DO THINK THE FINISHED PRODUCT, WHATEVER

THE COURT APPROVES, CERTAINLY SHOULD BE MADE PUBLIC. I THINK,

AT LEAST FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE, WE THOUGHT THAT MAYBE IT MADE

SOME SENSE TO SUBMIT THE PROPOSAL TO YOUR HONOR IN CAMERA SO

YOUR HONOR COULD MAKE THE DETERMINATION AS TO WHAT SHOULD BE

USED.

THE COURT: WHAT'S THE SENSE OF THAT FROM YOUR VIEWPOINT? WHY SHOULD THAT NOT BE IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN?

MR. FORGE: AGAIN, THEY'RE OUT THERE -- I'M NOT ADVOCATING -- I'M NOT GOING TO TAKE A STRONG POSITION ON THAT ISSUE. THAT'S FINE. THERE ARE CERTAIN QUESTIONS, THOUGH, THAT WERE OBJECTED TO BY US. AND PEOPLE MAY DRAW CONCLUSIONS ONE WAY OR THE OTHER WHETHER OR NOT THEY WIND UP MAKING IT TO THE FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE.

EVEN AS WE DISCUSS IT, I CAN'T ARTICULATE UNDER THE

PRESS ENTERPRISE STANDARD OR ANY OTHER SUPREME COURT STANDARD

FOR PUBLIC ACCESS WHY THIS WOULD CONSTITUTE A COMPELLING NEED

TO KEEP IT FROM THE PUBLIC. I THINK YOUR HONOR HAS RIGHTLY

RAISED THE ISSUE AND FLESHED OUT THE FACT THAT WE REALLY CAN'T

1 JUSTIFY IT.

2.4

THE COURT: MR. GRANGER, YOU AND I ARE ON THE SAME SIDE OF THAT ISSUE ON THE TRANSCRIPTS. THIS SEEMS TO BE A VERY INCONSISTENT POSITION TO SAY THAT I'M GOING TO TAKE THE PROPOSALS IN CAMERA AND THEN ONLY THE FINISHED PRODUCT COMES OUT. AS I SAID, I THINK IT'S A MATTER OF TIME BEFORE PEOPLE KNOW WHAT'S GOING TO BE IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE ANYWAY. IF THERE'S ARGUMENTS ABOUT WHAT SHOULD AND SHOULDN'T BE IN THERE, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THOSE ARGUMENTS OUGHT TO BE AVAILABLE FOR THE PUBLIC TO REVIEW. AND THEY CAN DECIDE FOR THEMSELVES WHETHER THE ARGUMENTS HAVE MERIT AND WHETHER, AFTER I RULE ON THEM, I MADE THE RIGHT DECISION.

SO I'M NOT INCLINED TO ACCEPT THOSE IN CAMERA. I
THINK THEY OUGHT TO BE PUBLICLY FILED, AND I'LL MAKE A
DECISION.

SO THOSE WILL BE FILED TODAY, I UNDERSTAND?

MR. FORGE: THAT'S RIGHT. THEY'LL BE FILED WITHIN

30 MINUTES.

THE COURT: SO WE HAVE THE DATES READY. I REMIND EVERYONE THE DATE OF SEPTEMBER 18TH IS A FIRM DATE. THE TRIAL OF MR. WILKES AND MR. MICHAEL WILL GO FORWARD ON THAT DATE.

ANYTHING WE NEED TO DISCUSS BEFORE WE RECESS?

HEARING NO ONE, WE'RE IN RECESS.

MR. FORGE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

25 --000--

| | | 30 |
|----|-------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE TESTIMONY | |
| 4 | ADDUCED IN THE FOREGOING MATTER IS | |
| 5 | A TRUE RECORD OF SAID PROCEEDINGS. | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | S/EVA OEMICK 8-7-07 | |
| 8 | EVA OEMICK DATE | |
| 9 | OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |
| | | |